UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,780	11/17/2003	Wanmo Wong	400.233US01	2431

27073 7590 07/17/2006

LEFFERT JAY & POLGLAZE, P.A.
P.O. BOX 581009
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458-1009

EXAMINER	
FLOURNOY, HORACE L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2189	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/714,780	WONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Horace L. Flournoy	2189	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 May 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office action has been issued in response to amendment filed 1 May 2006. Claims 1-44 are pending. Applicant's arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered, but they are not entirely persuasive, as will be discussed in more detail below, even in light of the instant amendments. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL.

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-34, 37-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Sekine (U.S. Patent Number 5,896,398 hereafter referred to as Sekine)** with **Microsoft Computer Dictionary (MSCD), 5th edition offered as extrinsic evidence**.

With respect to **independent claim 1,**

> *"A method of operating a non-volatile memory* **[Sekine discloses in column 1, line 13, "A flash memory is a non-volatile IC memory..."]**

device driver **[The MSCD defines "device driver" on page 155 as "a software component that permits a computer system to communicate with a device..." Sekine teaches a device driver, in column 7, lines 26-30.]** *comprising: counting a number of access cycles to a non-volatile memory;* **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *and halting ~~execution~~ access to the non-volatile memory at a selected count."* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." Also see column 7, lines 35-40.]**

With respect to **independent claim 11,**

"A method of operating a system comprising: counting a number of access operations; **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *to a Flash memory device* **[Sekine discloses in column 1, line 13, "A flash memory is a non-volatile IC memory..."]** *coupled to a host;* **[FIG. 1, element 20, "EWS"]** *and stopping access execution to the Flash memory at a selected number of access operations."* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." Also see column 7, lines 35-40.]**

With respect to **independent claim 20,**

"A method of testing a Flash memory **[see Title of invention]** *comprising: counting a number of access operations to a Flash memory* **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *for a Flash command;* **["command" is disclosed in column 1, line 24]** *interrupting execution of the Flash command at a selected halt count of access operations, halting access to the Flash memory;* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]** *and executing a power loss recovery cycle to test power loss recovery at the selected halt count."* **[disclosed in column 6, lines 18-29 and column 1, lines 30-31, Sekine teaches test system which can monitor the voltage or power of the Flash memory driver at various intervals]**

With respect to **independent claim 31,**

"A method of profiling a Flash command comprising: counting a number of access operations to a Flash memory during execution of **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *a Flash command to create an access operation profile for the Flash command;* **["command" is disclosed in column 1, line 24]** *and comparing the access operation profile two or more Flash commands."* **[disclosed in column 1, lines 54-64]**

With respect to **independent claim 33, and claim 38,**

"A system comprising: at least one Flash memory device; **[Sekine discloses in column 1, line 13, "A flash memory is a non-volatile IC memory..."]** *and a host coupled to the at least one Flash memory device,* **["...engineering work station (EWS)..." disclosed in column 1, line 64- column 2, line 4]** *wherein the host is adapted to count a number of access operations to the at least one Flash memory device during a Flash command and halt execution of the Flash command, stopping access to the Flash memory device at a selected count of access operations."* **[column 2, lines 5-14 and column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." Also see column 7, lines 35-40.]**

With respect to **independent claim 40,**

"A machine-usable medium, **[e.g. Flash memory module that stores a program]** *the machine-usable medium containing a software routine* **["software process....software procedure" disclosed in column 7, lines 29-34]** *for causing a processor to execute a method,* **[column 1, lines 20-23]** *wherein the method comprises: counting a number of access cycles to a Flash memory; and halting execution at a selected count, halting access to the Flash memory."* **[Sekine further discloses in**

column 8, lines 38-50, "At least one or more data processing programs to perform the display process are stored in the DISK 21. Such programs include a condition set program to create a condition data file, a device test program..."]

With respect to **independent claim 43,**

"A system comprising: at least one Flash memory device; **[Sekine discloses in column 1, line 13, "A flash memory is a non-volatile IC memory..."]** *and a host coupled to the at least one Flash memory device,* **["...engineering work station (EWS)..." disclosed in column 1, line 64- column 2, line 4]** *"*

The following limitations of **claim 43** are interpreted under 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph.

> The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, in its en banc decision In re Donaldson Co., 16 F.3d 1189, 29 USPQ2d 1845 (Fed. Cir. 1994), decided that a "means-or-step-plus-function" limitation should be interpreted in a manner different than patent examining practice had previously dictated. The Donaldson decision affects only the manner in which the scope of a "means or step plus function" limitation in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, is interpreted during examination. Donaldson does not directly affect the manner in which any other section of the patent statutes is interpreted or applied.
> When making a determination of patentability under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103, past practice was to interpret a "means or step plus function" limitation by giving it the "broadest reasonable interpretation." Under the PTO's long-standing practice this meant interpreting such a limitation as reading on any prior art means or step which performed the function specified in the claim without regard for whether the prior art means or step was equivalent to the corresponding structure, material or acts described in the specification. However, in Donaldson, the Federal Circuit stated:
>
> Per our holding, the "broadest reasonable interpretation" that an examiner may give means-plus-function language is that statutorily mandated in

paragraph six. Accordingly, the PTO may not disregard the structure disclosed in the specification corresponding to such language when rendering a patentability determination. (MPEP 2181)

According to the applicant's specification in paragraph [0035], the Examiner notes that the means or system/structure ("**device driver**") for practice of the invention disclosed in the following limitation of Claim 35, is further taught in

Sekine as follows:

"...wherein the host comprises a means for counting the number of access cycles **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *to the at least one Flash memory device during execution of a Flash command..."* **["command" is disclosed in column 1, line 24] [NOTE: The examiner interprets device driver as "data processing programs" disclosed by Sekine in column 8, line 38.]**

According to the applicant's specification in paragraph [0037], the Examiner notes that the means or system/structure ("**device driver**") for practice of the invention disclosed in the following limitation of Claim 43, is further taught in

Sekine as follows:

"...and comprises a means for halting execution **[..."process terminates"]** *of the Flash command on the at least one Flash memory*

device in response to the count of the access cycle counting means, stopping access to the Flash memory device." **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." Also see column 7, lines 35-40.]**

With respect to **claim 2**,

"The method of claim 1, wherein the driver is a low level driver." **[The MSCD defines "device driver" on page 155 as "a software component that permits a computer system to communicate with a device..." Sekine teaches a device driver, in column 7, lines 26-30.]**

With respect to **claim 3**,

"The method of claim 1, wherein counting the number of access cycles further comprises counting the number of write cycles." **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]**

With respect to **claims 4, 12, 21, 32, 34, and 41,**

"The method of claim 1, wherein counting the number of access cycles further comprises counting the number of erase cycles." **[disclosed e.g. in column 1, lines 7-10, "...counts the numbers of times of write or erase operations..." Also see column 1, lines 5-7]**

With respect to **claims 5 and 16**,

"The method of claim 1, further comprising: restarting execution of the non-volatile memory command **["command" is disclosed in column 1, line 24]** *after halting execution at the selected count."* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." The examiner notes that the next test can be the same as the previous test, thereby restarting the test.]**

With respect to **claims 6 and 15**,

"The method of claim 1, further comprising: testing driver power loss recovery **[disclosed in column 6, lines 18-29 and column 1, lines 30-31, Sekine teaches test system which can monitor the voltage or power of the Flash memory driver at various intervals]** *after halting ~~execution~~ access to the non-volatile memory at the selected count."* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." Different tests can be ran according to the user's preference]**

With respect to **claims 7, 25, and 42,**

"The method of claim 1, wherein halting ~~execution~~ access to the non-volatile memory at a selected count further comprises at a selected number of access cycles, **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]** *counting the number of clock cycles and halting execution of the access cycle at a selected number of clock cycles."* **["The timing generator 12 generates clock timing signals which determine the overall timings of the test system and sends the clock timing signals to the pattern generator 13."]**

With respect to **claims 8, and 17,**

"The method of claim 7, wherein halting execution of the access cycle at a selected number of clock cycles **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]** *further comprises removing power from the non-volatile memory."* **[disclosed in column 6, lines 18-29 and column 1, lines 30-31, Sekine teaches test system which can monitor the voltage or power of the Flash memory driver at various intervals]**

With respect to **claims 9, 18, and 29,**

"The method of claim 7, wherein halting execution of the access cycle at a selected number of clock cycles **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]** *further comprises loading an internal register* **[internal register is interpreted by the examiner as "condition set program" disclosed in column 8, line 40]** *in the non-volatile memory and halting execution of a command execution logic of the non-volatile memory at the selected number of clock cycles."* **[column 7, lines 19-21]**

With respect to **claims 10, 19, and 30,**

"The method of claim 7, wherein halting execution of the access cycle at a selected number of clock cycles **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]** *further comprises loading an internal register***[internal register is interpreted by the examiner as "condition set program" disclosed in column 8, line 40]** *in the non-volatile memory and halting execution of a command execution logic state machine* **[FIGs. 1, 3]***of the non-volatile memory at a selected number of steps."* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...the predetermined maximum number of times."]**

With respect to **claim 13**,

> *"The method of claim 11, further comprising: examining a state* **["fail analysis", column 7, line 21]** *of one or more host registers and/or the memory device* **[flash memory]** *after stopping execution."* **[column 7, lines 20-24, "...the process terminates..."]**

With respect to **claim 14**,

> *"The method of claim 11, further comprising: rebooting the host* **[FIG. 1, element 20, "EWS"]** *after stopping access execution to the Flash memory."* **[It is notoriously well known to anyone of ordinary skill in the art that a workstation or host can be rebooted after stopping execution.]**

With respect to **claims 22 and 27,**

> *"The method of claim 20, further comprising: changing the selected halt count;* **[column 7, lines 19-21 "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times..."]** *re-executing the Flash command;* **[column 7, lines 19-21 "...the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]** *counting a number of access operations;* **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *and interrupting execution of the Flash command at the changed halt count."* **[column 7,**

lines 19-21, "...the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]

With respect to **claims 23 and 28,**

"The method of claim 22, wherein changing the selected halt count **["...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times..."]** *further comprises incrementing the selected halt count."* **[column 7, lines 19-21. Sekine teaches that the predetermined maximum number of times (halt count) can be changed or incremented.]**

With respect to **claim 24**,

"The method of claim 22, further comprising: changing the Flash command after all possible halt counts of the Flash command have been tested." **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]**

With respect to **claims 26 and 39,**

"The method of claim 25, wherein interrupting execution of the access operation at a selected number of clock cycles **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined**

maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."] *further comprises triggering external hardware* **[disclosed e.g. in column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 4]** *to remove power from the Flash memory."*

With respect to **claim 37**,

"The system of claim 33, wherein the host **["...engineering work station (EWS)..." disclosed in column 1, line 64- column 2, line 4]** is one of a processor and an external memory controller." **[disclosed in column 6, lines 18-22, "In FIG. 1, the flash memory test system includes an engineering work station (EWS) 20 with a large capacity storage DISK 21 and a test processor 11 both of which are connected to a tester hardware through a tester bus."]**

With respect to **claim 44**,

"The system of claim 43..."

The following limitations of **claim 44** are interpreted under 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph.

According to the applicant's specification in paragraph [0035], the Examiner notes that the means or system/structure ("**device driver**") for practice of the invention disclosed in the following limitation of Claim 35, is further taught in

Sekine as follows:

"...wherein the host comprises a means for counting the number of access cycles **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *to the at least one Flash memory device during execution of a Flash command..."* **["command" is disclosed in column 1, line 24] [NOTE: The examiner interprets device driver as "data processing programs" disclosed by Sekine in column 8, line 38.]**

According to the applicant's specification in paragraph [0037], the Examiner notes that the means or system/structure ("**device driver**") for practice of the invention disclosed in the following limitation of Claim 43, is further taught in

Sekine as follows:

"...and comprises a means for halting execution **[..."process terminates"]** *of the Flash command on the at least one Flash memory device in response to the count of the access cycle counting means."* **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test."]**

"...when a means for timing the execution of a last access cycle has elapsed." ["...predetermined maximum number of times..." disclosed in column 7, lines 19-21]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere* CO., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims **35** and **36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sekine (U.S. Patent no. 5,896,398) in view of Kim (US PG Pub No. 2003/0075609 hereafter referred to as Kim).

With respect to claim 35, Sekine teaches *"wherein the at least one Flash memory device ..."* as shown in column 1, lines1-12. With respect to claim 36, Sekine teaches *"wherein an interface to the Flash memory device ..."* as shown in FIG.1.

Sekine, however, does not disclose *expressly "...is one of a NAND Flash and a NOR Flash"* of claim 35. Sekine also does not disclose *expressly "...is one of a PCMCIA-ATA, a Compact Flash (CF), a USB Flash, MemoryStick, Secure Digital Memory Card, and a multimedia card (MMC) compatible interface"* of claim 36.

With respect to claim 35, Kim discloses in paragraph [0019], "...NAND-type flash memory." With respect to claim 36, Kim discloses in paragraph 0005, "...a memory card such as an SMC (Smart Media Card) and MMC (Multimedia Memory Card)."

Sekine and Kim are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being memory card or flash memory devices.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a flash memory as a NAND-type flash memory because flash memory is usually implemented as either NOR or NAND-type. Also at the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a flash memory as an MMC in order to interface with MMC readers.

The motivation for doing so would have been obvious based on the teaching of Kim in paragraph [0006], "A memory card based on a flash memory recently developed is very popular due to the card's high capability of data transmission."

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teachings of Sekine and Kim before him/her to combine Kim and Sekine for the benefit of having a NAND-type flash memory implemented as an MMC to obtain the inventions as specified in claims 35 and 36.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ISSUES RAISED BY THE APPLICANT

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed **April 7, 2006** have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive and, as required by **M.P.E.P. 707.07(f)**, a response to these arguments appears below.

ARGUMENTS CONCERNING PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 1:

With respect to the arguments on pages 9-11 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 1 because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference. As interpreted by the examiner the following claim limitations are taught by the prior art: "*comprising: counting a number of access cycles to a non-volatile memory;* **[disclosed e.g. in column 4, lines 42-45]** *and halting ~~execution~~ access to the non-volatile memory at a selected count.*" **[column 7, lines 19-21, "...when the writing test is repeated until the predetermined maximum number of times, the process terminates and proceeds to the next test." Also see column 7, lines 35-40.]** Specifically the applicant's arguments on page 9, paragraph 2 and page 10, paragraph 3 offer no patentably distinguishing evidence, as

stated in the claims. The examiner advises the applicant to amend the claims so as to more clearly claim the limitations argued on page 9, paragraph 2 (lines 1-6) and page 10, paragraph 3 (lines 1-4).

With respect to the applicant's arguments on page 10, paragraph 2, the examiner has shown, as stated in the rejection to claim 1 above, that Sekine teaches the use of a device driver.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 11:

With respect to the arguments on page 11 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 11 because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 20:

With respect to the arguments on page 11 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 20 because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 31:

With respect to the arguments on page 11 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 31 because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 33:

With respect to the arguments on page 11 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 33 because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 40:

With respect to the arguments on page 12 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 40

because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claim 43:

With respect to the arguments on page 12 of the applicant's remarks, the examiner acknowledges the applicant's arguments with regard to the differences in teachings of Sekine and the applicant. However, the examiner maintains his stance on the rejection of claim 43 because the applicant's *claim language* is taught by the prior art of reference.

POINT OF ARGUMENT for Claims 35 and 36

Discussed supra in the argument to claim 33. As such, the rejection stands to claims 35 and 36.

CONCLUSION

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Direction of Future Correspondences

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Horace L. Flournoy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM (ET).

Important Note

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reginald G. Bragdon can be reached on (571) 272-4204. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Information regarding the status of an Application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private Pair only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Horace L. Flournoy

Patent Examiner
Art unit: 2189

Reginald G. Bragdon

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100